

### **REMARKS**

Claims 8-14, 17-18, 23-27, 30-31, 39-42, 45-46, 51-55, 58-59, 67-70, 73-74, 79-83, 86-87, and 137-142 are pending, with claims 140-142 being independent. Claims 1-7, 15-16, 19-22, 28-29, 32-38, 43-44, 47-50, 56-57, 60-66, 71-72, 75-78, 84-85, and 88-136 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 8-11, 17, 23-24, 26, 30, 39-42, 45, 51-52, 54, 58-59, 67-70, 73, 79-80, 82, 86, and 137-139 have been amended. Claims 140-145 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, at Fig. 8 and pages 26-28 of the Application.

#### **Claims 8-14, 23-27, 30-32, 39-42, 51-55, 58-60, 67-70, 79-83, 86 and 87**

Claims 8-14, 23-27, 30-31, 39-42, 51-55, 58-59, 67-70, 79-83, 86 and 87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan (6,075,863) in view of Fleming (6,473,854), Onosaka (5,961,608) and Perlman (6,023,585)

Independent claims 140, 141, and 142 recite a system (claim 140), a method (claim 141) and a computer program (claim 142) for installing computer software components on a client device for enabling connectivity to a host system by at least one of several different hardware devices.

Independent claim 140 recites, among other features, “a selection module that is structured and arranged to select a hardware device from several hardware devices of different physical connectivity types,” “a detection module that is structured and arranged to detect whether installation of a particular connectivity component is required to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using the selected hardware device,” where the detection module determines the required connectivity component by “generating an installation request to a remote host, receiving a reply to the installation request from the remote host, wherein the reply identifies the required connectivity component if the remote host determines that enabling connectivity between the client device and the host system is feasible using the selected hardware device, and determining whether the connectivity component is stored locally on the client device.” (emphasis added).

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Krishnan, Fleming, Onosaka, and Perlman, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest at least the above features.

Krishnan does not teach or suggest a selection module that is structured and arranged to select a hardware device from several hardware devices of different physical connectivity types. See Office Action of May 28, 2008 at p. 4.

Krishnan also does not teach or suggest whether installation of a particular connectivity component is required to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using the selected hardware device. Rather, Krishnan teaches a negotiation sequence for an encryption applet between two modems over an existing connection. See Col. 3:57-60. The Office Action agrees. See Office Action of May 28, 2008 at p. 4.

For the same reason, Krishnan also fails to teach or suggest “generating an installation request to a remote host” and “receiving a reply to the installation request from the remote host, wherein the reply identifies the required connectivity component if the remote host determines that enabling connectivity between the client device and the host system is feasible using the selected hardware device,” as recited in claim 140. In particular, because Krishnan deals with communications over the existing connection, Krishnan is also entirely silent about the remote host determining whether enabling connectivity between the client device and the host system is feasible using the selected hardware device.

Fleming also fails to disclose or suggest the above feature. In Fleming, the client lacks an ability to select a hardware device from several hardware devices of different physical connectivity types. For this reason, the system in Fleming does not receive a reply to the installation request from the remote host, “wherein the reply identifies the required connectivity component if the remote host determines that enabling connectivity between the client device and the host system is feasible using the selected hardware device.” as recited in claim 140.

Onosaka and Perlman do not remedy the above failures of Krishnan and Fleming, and, notably, are not relied upon by the Final Office Action to describe or suggest these features that are not present in Krishnan and Fleming.

In summary, Krishnan, Fleming, Onosaka, and Perlman, either together, or in a combination do not describe or suggest a detection module of claim 140. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 140, 141, and 142, and their respective dependent claims.

Furthermore, new claims 143-145 are also believed to be allowable because they further recite determining whether a physical connectivity type of the selected hardware device is supported in the geographical area of the client device – a feature not disclosed or suggested by Krishnan, Fleming, Onosaka, and Perlman.

**Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74**

Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74, which depend from claims 140, 141 and 142, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan in view of Fleming, Onosaka and Perlman, and further in view of Coutts (6,311,165).

With respect to these claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Coutts does not remedy the failure of Krishnan, Fleming, Onosaka, and Perlman to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims and, notably, is not relied upon in the Final Office Action as describing the features missing from those references.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee of \$120 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050.

Applicant : Tuan Huu Pham et al.  
Serial No. : 09/855,683  
Filed : May 16, 2001  
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-  
0136001 / Communications 38

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/29/08

/Dmitry Brant/

---

Dmitry Brant  
Reg. No. 59,133

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

40520813.doc